



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/812,173	03/30/2004	Hung-Yi Lin	GEN0014-US	3347

7590 06/14/2005
Michael D. Bednarek
Shaw Pittman LLP
1650 Tysons Boulevard
McLean, VA 22102

EXAMINER

RAHMJOO, MANUCHER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2676

DATE MAILED: 06/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/812,173

Applicant(s)

LIN ET AL.

Examiner

Mike Rahmjoo

Art Unit

2676

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3/30/04.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "...with the said predefined..." in lines 4- 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "...to fancy the user interface..." in line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "...for arranging the pattern codes..." inline 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "...on the user interface display window..." in line 7. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "...output the mixed signal..." in line 9. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 11 has similar rejections.

Claims 2- 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As per claim 1 line 2 applicant recites "...image module unit for dealing with...". It is not made clear how an image module unit "deals". Is it processing or containing a pattern.

As per claims 2- 10 and 12 applicant recites each claim using "...a user interface...". It is not clear whether it is the same user interface display of independent claims.

As per claim 5 line 2 applicant recites "...using overlap to mix the patterns...". It is not clear what applicant is claiming. Is it the mixer unit which is performing the mixing.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3- 7 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yukata et al (U Patent 5,917,504), hereinafter, Yutaka.

As per claims 1 and 11 Yutaka teaches an image module unit (see for example of figure 1) for dealing with predefined image patterns see for example figure 5a; a texture pattern unit (see for example fig. 2 for the AT block) for providing texture patterns to mix with the said predefined image pattern to fancy the user interface display see for example column 5 lines 30- 36 and column 8 lines 35- 35 wherein texture

patterns are mapped and transformed; a display code-buffer unit (see for example fig.2 block AD) for arranging the pattern codes which are displayed on the user interface display window see for example column 8 lines 35- 45 wherein texture patterns are arranged and displayed on image display monitor 65; and a mixer unit for mixing the patterns from said image module unit and texture pattern unit, and output the mixed signal see for example column 9 lines 46- 56 wherein the pictorial image is synthesized (mixed) with the background motion picture, the image data of the background motion picture is decompressed decoded and column 10 lines 51- 60 wherein transformation is executed by mixing.

As per claim 3 Yutaka teaches the predefined image pattern could be any combination of dot pixel see for example column 4 lines 5- 15 for the two modes with two different number of bits.

As per claim 4 Yutaka teaches the texture patterns can be defined by end-user (user control) see for example column 8 lines 1- 9.

As per claim 5 Yutaka teaches the mixer unit using overlap to mix the patterns from said image module unit and texture pattern unit see for example column 8 lines 35- 45 for the mapping and transformation of the texture patterns.

As per claim 7 Yutaka teaches the mixer unit using logic operation (imaging commands) to mix the patterns from said image module unit and texture pattern unit see for example figures 1- 10 and column 3 lines 59- 65.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 8- 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yutaka.

As per claims 2 and 12 Yutaka does not teach an outline shape index generator for providing the mixing index information to define the outline shape.

However, the background of Yutaka teaches an outline shape index generator for providing the mixing index information to define the outline shape see for example column 1 lines 20- 32 wherein the surface of an object is decomposed into plurality of polygons (polygons with shapes) and the thereafter reconstructed (mixed).

It would have been made obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of the background of the prior art made of the reference into Yutaka to define the outline of a shape and therefore keep the cost down and utilize the same conventional memory to reconstruct an image which can be stereographically seen see for example column 1. lines 20- 60.

As per claim 8 Yutaka teaches the shape index generator further comprising sub-window define outline function see for example fig. 2 wherein texture patterns are performed through AT and figures 5 a- c for the mapping and transformation of patterns into new coordinates.

As per claim 9 Yutaka teaches the outline shape index generator further using alpha index for image pattern see for example figure 2 for block AC which is for the CLUT transformation.

As per claim 10 Yutaka teaches the outline shape index generator further using color key method for image pattern see for example column 5 lines 30- 45 for the CLUT.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 6 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

None of the prior art, either singularly or in combination, fairly teaches or suggests applicant's claimed invention wherein applicant recites" the mixer unit using alpha blending method, where $\text{output} = (\text{pattern from said image module limit}) \times \alpha + (\text{pattern from said texture pattern unit}) \times (1 - \alpha)$, the parameter alpha is a real number between 0 and 1.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure; US patent 5,920,303, 6,392,643, 6,097,402, 6,011,564, 4,808,988 and US PAP 2002/0008703.

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mike Rahmjoo whose telephone number is (571) 272-7789. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30- 3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Bella can be reached on (571) 272- 7778. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872- 9306 for regular communications and After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-4357.

Mike Rahmjoo

June 8, 2005



MATTHEW C. BELLA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600